

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

Atty. Dkt. No. NVDA/P001173

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated October 18, 2005 having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on January 18, 2006. Claims 1-25 were examined. The Examiner rejected claims 1-25. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-4 and 23-25

Claims 1-4 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Goh* (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,015). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 23, as amended, each recite the limitations of (i) a texture that has the same dimensions as the desktop display surface and (ii) a two dimensional rectangular object that has the same dimensions as the desktop display surface. At least a portion of the texture is applied (using texture mapping) to the two dimensional rectangular object to display an optionally scaled portion of the desktop display surface.

The examiner relies on *Goh* for the teaching that "windows are applied to the faces of a cube by a process known as texture-mapping." Although *Goh* teaches texture mapping a window to a face of a cube, *Goh* fails to teach or suggest that the dimensions of the texture are the same as the dimensions of the desktop display surface or that the dimensions of a face of the cube are the same as the dimensions of the desktop display surface, as required by claims 1 and 23. In particular, *Goh* provides an example of a cube face with a total surface area of 16 inches compared with a screen with a total surface area of 48 inches. By having smaller dimensions than the screen, the cube face permits "a user to view a larger effective workspace than would be possible in a standard two-dimensional window." (see *Goh* col., 5 lines 22-32). Thus, under the express teaching of *Goh*, it is undesirable for a face of the cube to have the same dimensions as the desktop display surface (screen), as required by claims 1 and 23, since the face would occupy the entire desktop display surface.

Claims 2 and 24 have been canceled. Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to depend from claim 1. In addition, claims 3-4 and 25 depend from claims 1 and 23,

Page 9

424455_1

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005
Atty. Dkt. No. NVDA/P001173

respectively, and are patentable for the same reasons as set forth above for claims 1 and 23.

Based on the foregoing distinctions, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3, 4, 23, and 25 are patentable over *Goh*.

Claims 15-18

Claims 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Goh* in view of *Dumesny*, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 08/903,440) and in further view of *Falk* (U.S. Patent No. 5255352). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 as amended recites the limitations of (i) a texture that has the same dimensions as the desktop display surface and (ii) a two dimensional rectangular object that has the same dimensions as the desktop display surface. As previously described, *Goh* fails to teach or suggest that the dimensions of the texture are the same as the dimensions of the desktop display surface or that the dimensions of a face of the cube are the same as the dimensions of the desktop display surface. Further, both *Falk* and *Dumesny* also fail to teach or suggest these limitations. Thus, the combination of *Goh*, *Falk*, and *Dumesny* cannot render claim 15 obvious.

Claims 16-18 depend from claim 15 and are patentable for the same reasons as set forth above for claim 15.

Based on the foregoing distinctions, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-18 are patentable over the combination of *Goh*, *Dumesny*, and *Falk*.

Claims 5-14 and 19-22

Claims 5-14 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Goh* in view of *Dumesny*, et al. and in further view of *Falk*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-15 and 19-22 depend from claims 1 and 15, respectively, and are patentable for the same reasons as set forth above for claims 1 and 15.

Furthermore, claims 10-14, 19-22, and claim 26 recite limitations for calculating a texture addressing extent or texture addressing offsets. The examiner relies on *Falk* for the teaching that "information must be supplied concerning the relative size of the image

Page 10

424455_1

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

Atty. Dkt. No. NVDA/P001173

versus the relative size of the flattened pattern piece (scale factor) relative X and Y offsets from a base position (translation)." (see *Falk*, col. 10, lines 21-29). Although *Falk* teaches that a scale factor and translation are needed to compute texture address coordinates, *Falk* does not teach how the texture address coordinates of the vertices are computed using the scale factor and translation. The examiner relies on *Dumesny* for the teaching of "capabilities that allow users to manually zoom in/out, dolly, rotate, etc. as desired." (see *Dumesny*, et al. Paragraph 0072). Although *Dumesny* teaches a method that allows a user to directly manipulate the positioning of a texture on an object, *Dumesny* does not teach how the texture address coordinates of the vertices are computed based on the user manipulations.

In sharp contrast, the limitations of claims 10-14 and 19-22 detail specific techniques for computing the texture addressing coordinates for each vertex of the two dimensional rectangular object using the zoom factor and offsets. *Falk* nor *Dumesny* teaches or suggests any of the details recited in claims 10-14 and 19-22. This failure further distinguishes claims 10-14 and 19-22 from the references and provides yet another reason why the combination of *Goh*, *Falk*, and *Dumesny* cannot render these claims obvious.

Based on the foregoing distinctions, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-14 and 19-22 are patentable over the combination of *Goh*, *Dumesny*, and *Falk*.

Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005
Atty. Dkt. No. NVDA/P001173


Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed. Applicant reserves the right to subsequently take up prosecution of the claims as originally filed in this application in a continuation, a continuation-in-part and/or a divisional application. If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephanie Winner
Registration No. 52,371
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Agent for Applicant